

REMARKS

Claims 1, 9, and 14 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. These claims, as amended, recite a tube having a slot open to an end of the tube. The amendments to the claims are supported by material throughout the specification, especially Figure 2, which shows how slot 18 is not a closed hole but is open to the end of the tube. Claims 1, 11, 12, and 16 have been amended to recite a “slot” instead of a “notch” in response to the Examiner’s objection. Applicant submits that the amendment does not change the scope of the invention. Claims 11 and 15 have been cancelled, and their dependent claims 12 and 16 have been amended to depend from claims 9 and 14, respectively.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 14-16, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Forster. Applicant submits that the amendments to claims 1 and 14 render this rejection moot. Forster discloses a pulsation dampener device having a diaphragm disposed about a central tube. The tube has a plurality of holes through its wall that provide fluidic communication between the interior of the tube and a space between the interior of the diaphragm and the exterior of the tube. In contrast, claims 1 and 14, as amended, recite that the tube has at least one slot that is open to the end of the tube. The holes of Forster are blind with respect to the ends of the tube. Applicant submits that claims 1 and 14, and claims 2, 4-8, 16, and 18, which depend from claim 1 or claim 14, are patentable in view of Forster.

Claims 14-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Mercier. Applicant submits that the amendments to claim 14 render this rejection moot. Mercier discloses a pulse dampener unit having a flexible bladder surrounding a tube. The tube has a plurality of holes that provide communication between an interior of the tube and a space between the exterior of the tube and the diaphragm. In contrast, claim 14, as amended, recites that the tube has at least one slot that is open to the end of the tube. The holes of Mercier are blind with respect to the ends of the tube. Applicant submits that claim 14 and claims 16-18, which depend from claim 14, are patentable in view of Mercier.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3 and 9-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious in view of Forster. Applicant submits that the amendments to claim 1, from which claim 3 depends, and claim 9 render the rejection moot. Applicant submits that Forster fails to disclose or suggest the use of a tube having at least one slot open to an end of the tube, as recited by amended claims 1 and 9. As a result, Applicant submits that claims 3 and 9 and claims 10, 12 and 13, which depend from claim 9, are patentable in view of Mercier.

Objection to the drawings

The Examiner objects to the drawings for failing to illustrate all the features recited in the claims. New Figure 2A is attached.

Please charge any fees associated with this filing, or apply any credits, to our Deposit Account No. 03-1721.

Respectfully submitted,



Valarie B. Rosen

Registration Number 45,698

Date: December 14, 2004

Choate, Hall & Stewart
Exchange Place
53 State Street
Boston, MA 02109
(617) 248-5000
3776970_1.DOC

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

An drawing sheet(s) is attached to this Response as an Appendix. These replacement sheets include new Figure 2A. These amendments correct the informalities noted in the objections to the drawings by the Examiner. The subject matter of the drawing is described by the specification at page 4, lines 19-24. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that all objections to the drawings be withdrawn.